To those who sail across the great ocean under the colors of revealed religion we dip our flag in greeting—and a good voyage to them. Ours is a stormier course.

—W. MACNEILE DIXON

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 53 MARCH, 1965 NUMBER 5

TO HELP AND TEACH OTHERS

KNOWING what to say and when to say it—that is what many students of Theosophy long for above all. There is deep honesty in the longing, but also, in all likelihood, some vanity, since it is a rare individual indeed who has no secret image of himself going about, wisely instructing others in what they need to know. In fact, it is probably therapeutic to assume that vanity plays a part in a great many of our noblest undertakings. It may turn out that the acts and conversation of a person who is doing what he can to wither his own vanity have a particular penetration for others, who may feel the impersonal light in which he is working on himself. And this light may be what they needed to see by, more than anything else.

It is the presence of higher *Manas* in the transactions of the mind which has this effect. Being an impersonal intelligence and energy, higher manas does not really understand the idea of "virtue" and can therefore take no pride in virtuous achievement. *Knowing* is the business of the mind, and vanities are infantile distractions. So it is that the joy of discovery, the pure pleasure of understanding, and the thrill of coming upon clues of meaning—these are qualities which stir hungers in the minds of other men. The best teacher is not one who goes about "teaching" or "imparting." To think of oneself as doing this is almost priggishly personal. And who, it might be asked, could possibly be "helped" in this way? Who wants improvement as a by-product of adding to the luster of someone else's virtue?

No, men learn rather from feeling the excitement in another's thought-processes as they close in on a fresh idea of meaning. *He* is learning, and they, being like him, are able to learn, too.

The hunger to know has to be authentic, if it is to be of value to others. Play-acting doesn't help. Technique won't do it. Technique in actions which are supposed to represent shared discovery become deadly pedagogic clichés which even children see through—sooner, perhaps, than adults. A child will prefer the plain candor of an adult who tells him exactly what to do, as more acceptable than a cozy pretense that now *"we"* are going to learn this lesson, or start on a project which the child knows perfectly well the adult cares little about for himself.

Children know the demands of integrity without any instruction. They know what is authentic contact in human relations, and what is not. That is why being a good kindergartener is probably more difficult than being a good college professor. You can't play intellectual games with a child, to make up for lack of authentic educational content.

Of course, people *do* play games with children, and the children, alas, find out that it is to their interest to please the teacher and accept the role that is expected of them, and here begins the initial betrayal of the young. After ten or twelve years of this sort of role-playing, genuine education, for the youth who is trained in such pretense, may be the most frightening confrontation in the world. It is by such means that minds are closed, psychic natures made rigid, and generations of fearful conformists produced.

How does it become possible to break through such barriers? Well, H.P.B. gave her entire life to trying. A passage from Robert Crosbie is appropriate here:

> A *Siddha-Purusha* (perfect man) is like an archeologist who removes the dust and lays open an old well which has been covered up by ages of disuse. The *Avatara,* on the other hand, is like an engineer who sinks a well in a place where there was no water before. Great Men give salvation to those only who have the waters of piety hidden in themselves, but the *Avatara* saves him too whose heart is devoid of love and dry as a desert.

So, it becomes pretentious in the extreme to suppose that the fate of anyone else can depend upon our hitting upon just the right answer to a question, even though there may be a sense in which this is exactly the case.

Yet there is surely something in preparing oneself to communicate with others. Mr. Crosbie is again suggestive:

> Many of the statements made by the Teachers are axioms to be applied, while at the same time they are woven in with such reasoning as may suit the ordinary way of thinking. Most people imagine and accept as fact, that there is but one way of thinking —reasoning from premises to conclusions, and tabulating things in order to find the cause. . . .

The most important thing, it seems clear, is to have enough sympathy with other people to know a little about how they *feel.* We haven't any business, of course, in trying to "psychoanalyze" others —not even in order to "help" them. If we are thinking of them as objects, persons with little knots to be untied, we have only to consider how we would react if someone thought that way about us. The need is to speak to *egos,* no matter how deeply they may be hidden behind personalities, and this becomes possible only when we speak *as* egos. This is the meaning of mind-to-mind, or light-to-light.

Letters That Have Helped Me, by William Q. Judge, is an extraordinary text filled with examples of this kind of communication. Mr. Judge doesn't explain how he does it; he can't; nobody can; but there is nonetheless a criterion in this volume. Everyone who reads it thoughtfully and with an open heart knows it was written for *him.* Even what are ostensibly the most personal communications have a universal dimension. Judge is right there with you, where you are. Only, by a kind of double identity, he has roots somewhere else, also.

Judge's "unwritten" Veda is what reading him makes you feel about your own possibilities. There is really no other way to look at another human being. He is not someone you have opportunity to "instruct," but a focus in time and space of a set of divine possibilities—the universal dimension of every individual soul. To perceive this, though paradoxical, is also to recognize the uniqueness of the particular karmic burdens and opportunities, to realize why decisions both of attitude and action are the individual's, and his alone.

HERETICS AND THE RENAISSANCE

[The implication of the title of *The Secret Doctrine* is twofold. First, no teaching or belief, however exalted, can convey truth directly to the inner consciousness of man; the essence of a true "doctrine" is discovered only when it serves as a catalytic agent within the egoic processes of the individual—a "secret," until then, to be inwardly revealed.

The relationship of theosophical concepts to history, whether they are doctrinal or philosophical, can therefore be seen to parallel the primary psychological facts of "soul learning." In any age, when a doctrine is taken to be a truth, and when fanaticism compels lip service to exclusive group beliefs, the ideas of Theosophy seem buried and forgotten. We discover, however, that this is never entirely the case. The insistences of dogma and prejudice are like the snows which hide the promise of spring. But seeds survive beneath the snow and, even during the darkest centuries of Western history, there was heat and warmth enough under the surface to allow some of these seeds to germinate. In a sense, then, the history of the relationship between "heretics" and the "renaissance" is the history of every age.

Of the ten articles comprising the series, "Heretics and the Renaissance," the first seven are derived entirely from recognized historical sources; the remaining three consist solely of quotations from the writings of H. P. Blavatsky, making, in effect, a review *in the light of Theosophy* of the main ideas dealt with earlier. The theosophical student who has assembled this material has done what H.P.B. spoke of doing in her Introduction to *The Secret Doctrine*—put together "a nosegay of culled flowers," adding only "the string that ties them." While the scholars whose works are drawn upon may not have had before them the full perspective of the Theosophical Movement, its "story" is nonetheless implicit, and by skillful collation is made to appear between the lines. Editors, THEOSOPHY]

II—GROWING CRISIS IN THE CHURCH

The Age of Ignorance commenced with the Christian system.
—THOMAS PAINE

IT was among a population that was impressionable, emotional and superstitious, slowly awakening in the intellectual dawn, that orthodoxy and heterodoxy—the forces of conservatism and progress—were to fight the battle in which neither could win with permanent victory. It is a noteworthy fact, presaging the new form

which modern civilization and enlightenment were to assume, that the heresies which were to shake the Church to its foundations were no longer as of old, mere speculative subtleties propounded by learned theologians and prelates in the gradual evolution of Christian doctrine. We have not to deal with scholars and prelates who filled the Church with the disputatious wrangles of their learning. Hierarchical organization was too perfect, and theological dogma too thoroughly petrified, to admit of this. Nor have we, for the most part, to deal with the growing classes, for the alliance between Church and State to keep the people in subjection had been handed down from the Roman Empire, and however much monarchs like John of England or Frederic II had to explain of ecclesiastical pretensions, they never dared to loosen the foundations on which rested their own prerogatives. As a rule heresy had to be thoroughly disseminated among the people before those of gentle blood would meddle with it, as was the case in Languedoc and Lombardy. The blows which brought real danger to the hierarchy came from obscure men, laboring among the poor and oppressed, who in their misery and degradation felt that the Church had failed in its mission, whether through the worldliness of its ministers or through defects in its doctrine. Among these they found ready and eager listeners, and the heresies which they taught divide themselves into two classes. On the one hand we have sectaries holding fast to all the essentials of Christianity, with anti-sacerdotalism as their mainspring, and on the other hand we have Manichaeans. (Lea I, 60-61.)

As the twelfth century drew to a close, the Church was approaching a crisis in its career. The vicissitudes of a hundred and fifty years, skillfully improved, had rendered it the mistress of Christendom. History records no such triumph of intellect over brute strength as that which, in an age of turmoil and battle, was wrested from the fierce warriors of the time by priests who had no material force at their command, and whose power was based alone on the souls and consciences of men. Over soul and conscience their empire was complete. No Christian could hope for salvation who was not in all things an obedient son of the Church, and who was not ready to take up arms in its defense; and, in a time when faith was a determining factor of conduct, this belief created a spiritual despotism which placed all things within reach of him who would yield it. (Lea I, 1.)

If the sectaries became sufficiently numerous to form a commu-

nity of their own, cutting them off from the communion of the Church was of no avail; the keenest shafts of ecclesiastical censure rebounded harmless from their armor of conscientious belief. This naturally led to an animosity against them greater than that visited on the worst criminals. No matter how trivial may have been the original cause of schism, nor how pure and fervent might be the faith of the schismatics, the fact that they had refused to bend to authority, and had thus sought to divide the seamless garment of Christ, became an offense in comparison with which all other sins dwindled into insignificance, neutralizing all the virtues and all the devotion which men could possess. (Lea I, 211.)

The highest authorities in the Church admitted that its scandals were the cause if not the justification of heresy. The records of the time bear ample testimony to the rapine and violence, the flagrant crimes and defiant immorality of the princes of the Church. No more unexceptional witness as to the Church of the twelfth century can be had than St. Bernard, and he is never weary of denouncing the pride, the wickedness, the ambition, and the lust that reigned everywhere. (Lea I, 61; 13; 52.)

One of the main objects in convoking the great Council of Lateran, in 1215, was the correction of the prevailing vices of the clergy, and it adopted numerous canons looking to the suppression of the chief abuses, but in vain. Those abuses were too deeply rooted, and four years later Honorius II, in an Encyclical addressed to all the prelates of Christendom, says that he has waited to see the result. He finds the evils of the Church increasing rather than diminishing. The ministers of the altar, worse than beasts wallowing in their dung, glory in their sins as in Sodom. They are a snare and a destruction to the people. Many prelates consume the property committed to their trust and scatter the stores of the sanctuary throughout the public places; they promote the unworthy, waste revenues of the Church on the wicked, and convert churches into conventicles of their kind. Monks and nuns throw off the yoke, break their chains, and render themselves contemptible as dung. "Thus it is that heresies flourish. Let each of you gird his sword to his thigh and spare not his brother and his nearest of kindred." What was accomplished by this earnest exhortation may be estimated from the description which Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, gave of the Church in the presence of Innocent IV and his cardinals in 1250. The details can well be spared, but they are

summed up in his assertion that the clergy were a source of pollution to the whole earth; they were antichrists and devils masquerading as angels of light, who made the house of prayer a den of robbers. When the earnest inquisitor of Passau, about 1260, undertook to explain the stubborness of the heresy which he was vainly endeavoring to suppress, he did so by drawing up a list of the crimes prevalent among the clergy, which is awful in the completeness of its details. A church such as he describes was an unmitigated curse, politically, socially, and morally. (Lea I, 53-4.)

Nothing that the heretics could invent was likely to be more appalling than the reality as stated by the most resolute champions of the Church. Not many controversialists, indeed, were capable of the frank assurance of the learned author of the tract which passes under the name of Peter of Pilichdorf, in answering the arguments of the heretics, that the Catholic priests were fornicators and usurers and drunkards and dicers and forgers, by boldly saying, "What then? They are none the less priests, and the worst of men who is a priest is worthier than the most holy layman. Was not Judas Iscariot, on account of his apostleship, worthier than Nathaniel, though less holy?" (Lea I, 62.)

The Church, so far removed from its ideal and so derelict in its duties, found itself, somewhat unexpectedly, confronted by new dangers and threatened in the very citadel of its power. Just as its triumph over king and kaiser was complete, a new enemy arose in the awakened consciousness of man. The dense ignorance of the tenth century had begun in the eleventh to yield to the first faint pulsations of intellectual movement. Early in the twelfth century that movement already shows in its gathering force the promise of the development which was to render Europe the home of art and science, of learning, of culture, and civilization. The stagnation of the human mind could not thus be broken without leading to inquiry and doubt. When man began to reason and to ask questions, to criticize and to speculate on forbidden topics, it was not possible for them to avoid seeing how woeful was the contrast between the teaching and the practice of the Church, and how little correspondence existed between religion and ritual, between the lives of the monk and priest and the profession of their vows. Even the blind reverence which for generations had been felt for the utterances of the Church began to be shaken. (Lea I, 57.)

The blatent impudence of the traffic in absolutions exceeds be-

lief. Every crime "even to the rape of God's mother if that were possible" had its authorized tariff payable at Rome. Poisoning was absolved for eleven ducats and six livres tournois. Incest was priced at thirty-six livres and three ducats. Perjury as seven livres, three carlines. Murder (if not by poison) was less expensive. For one ducat, four livres, eight carlines a son might purchase the privilege of parricide, and so through the whole calendar of crimes. Outside the pale of this so-called "Church" was certain and eternal damnation. For centuries the axiom *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus* was the source of unutterable woe to humanity. (Bayley, pp. 198-9; see also notes on these pages, p. 258.)

Few as were the assailants as yet, and intermittent as were their attacks, the very number of the defenders and the vigor of the defence show the danger which was recognized as dwelling in the spirit of inquiry which had at last been partially aroused from its long slumber. (Lea I, 58.)

That spirit had received a powerful impulse from the school of Toledo, whither adventurous scholars flocked as to the fountain where they could obtain long draughts of Arabic, Grecian, and Jewish lore. The works of Aristotle and Ptolemy, of Abubekr, Avicenna and Alfarabi, and finally those of Averrhoes, were rendered into Latin, and were copied with incredible zeal in all lands of Christendom. The Crusaders, too, brought home with them fragmentary remains of ancient thought which met with an equally warm reception. Even more menacing to the Church was the revival of Civil Law. The ardor with which it came, by the middle of the twelfth century, to be studied in all the great centers of learning is incontestable, and men found to their surprise that there was a system of jurisprudence of wonderful symmetry and subtle adjustment of right, immeasurably superior to the clumsy and confused canon law and the barbarous feudal customs, while drawing its authority from immutable justice as represented by the sovereign, and not from canon or decretal, from pope or council, or even from Holy Writ. (Lea I, 59.)

* * *

Sources used in this installment: Henry Charles Lea, *A History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages,* Vol. I; Harold Bayley, *A New Light on the Renaissance* (J. M. Dent, London, 1909).

(*To be continued*)

THE THEOSOPHY OF THE UPANISHADS

THE CHHANDOGYA UPANISHAD is a sort of archetypal story with mystic allusions which utilize the language of poetry and song to indicate that the Inner Knowledge cannot be attained through liturgy or any formalities of instruction. The first two chapters discuss various sacrifices and worship, but, like *The Bhagavad-Gita,* point out that all these "sacrifices" have little meaning unless they are approached with the attitude of one seeking universal consciousness. This is the ever-recurrent "instruction" of the *Chhandogya* verses, and we find it immediately suggested by the familiar passages, sometimes titled, "That Thou Art," beginning:

> There lived once Shvetaketu, Aruna's grandson; his father addressed him, saying:
>
> Shvetaketu, go, learn the service of the Eternal; for no one, dear, of our family is an unlearned nominal worshipper.

While the teacher, in this case the "father," must speak always of this other dimension behind formal learning, he cannot expect the pupil to grasp at once that Secret Doctrine which is beyond, and never more than reflected in whatever forms of worldly instruction are obtainable. Therefore, the next sequence:

> So going when he was twelve years old, he returned when he was twenty-four; he had learned all the teachings, but was conceited, vain of his learning, and proud.
>
> His father addressed him:
>
> Shvetaketu, you are conceited, vain of your learning and proud, dear; but have you asked for that teaching through which the unheard is heard, the unthought is thought, the unknown is known?
>
> What sort of teaching is that, Master? said he.

In the language of Joseph Campbell's *Hero With a Thousand Faces,* Shvetaketu has not yet passed through those initiations which would enable him to see with the eyes of a redeemer or teacher. Instead, he is still an "apprentice hero" and must reach beyond the known to the unknown—with an attitude of humility which em-

bodies a different quality from that found in the "ambitious" student. Therefore, behind the heroic *image* is still to be found its reality. As Campbell puts it:

> The hero is rather a symbol to be contemplated than an example to be literally followed. The divine being is a revelation of the omnipotent Self, which dwells within us all. The contemplation of the life thus should be undertaken as a meditation on one's own immanent divinity, not as a prelude to precise imitation.

The most mysterious knowledge, in Krishna's phrasing in *The Bhagavad-Gita,* flows from inward sources and the *Chhandogya Upanishad* returns again to the theme of each one's cyclical participation in universal spiritual consciousness during dreamless sleep. Shvetaketu's father addresses him in these words:

> Learn from me, dear, the reality about sleep. When a man sinks to sleep, as they say, then, dear, he is wrapped by the Real; he has slipped back to his own. And so they say he sleeps, because he has slipped back to his own. And just as an eagle tied by a cord, flying hither and thither, and finding no other resting-place, comes to rest where he is tied, so indeed, dear, the man's Mind, flying hither and thither, and finding no other resting-place, comes to rest in vital Breath; for Mind, dear, is bound by vital breath.

The "touching" of universal consciousness, a sacred state reached during the passage of the night, bears a direct relationship to the mysteries of cosmogenesis. The "vital Breath," which symbolizes the capacity of individual man to return inviolate to his "own" state, is also the origin of all things and creatures. Here, then, in the *Chhandogya Upanishad,* is a poetic account of genesis:

> In the beginning, dear, there was Being, alone and secondless. But there are some who say that there was non-Being in the beginning, alone and secondless; so that Being would be born from non-Being; but how could this be so, dear? said he; how could Being be born from non-Being? So there was Being, dear, in the beginning, alone and secondless.
>
> Then Being beholding said: Let me become great; let me give birth.
>
> Then it put forth Radiance.
>
> Then Radiance beholding said: Let me become great; let me give birth.
>
> Then it put forth the Waters. Just as a man is hot and sweats, so from radiance the waters are born.

> Then the Waters beholding said: Let us become great; let us give birth.
>
> They put forth the world-food. Just as when it rains much food is produced, so from the Waters the world-food—*Earth*—is born.

A commentary from Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan's rendition of *The Principal Upanishads* is here suggestive. Dr. Radhakrishnan writes:

> The world form is not a complete expression or manifestation of the divine Reality. It is only a fragment of the divine that is manifested in the cosmic process. The World-soul is a partial expression of the Supreme Lord.
>
> Creation is interpreted in the Vedas as development rather than the bringing into being of something not hitherto existent. The first principle is manifested in the whole world. *Purusha* by his sacrifice becomes the whole world. This view prepares for the development of the doctrine which is emphasised in the Upanishads that the spirit in man is one with the spirit which is the *prius* of the world. Within this world we have the one positive principle of being and yet have varying degrees of existence marked by varying degrees of penetration or participation of nonentity by divine being.

Sacred knowledge, which requires progressive initiations for the man whom Campbell calls "the hero of self-achieved submission," arises as one discovers identity with "the creative principle, the cause of all existence." What is suggested is, in Radhakrishnan's words, "a fundamental kinship between the aspiring spirit of man and the spirit of the universe which it seeks to attain." Dr. Radhakrishnan continues:

> The wish to know the Real implies that we know it to some extent. If we do not know anything about it, we cannot even say that it is and that we wish to know it. If we know the Real, it is because the Real knows itself in us.
>
> The *Chhandogya Upanishad* gives us a story, where gods and demons both anxious to learn the true nature of the Self approach Praja-pati who maintains that the ultimate self is free from sin, free from old age, free from death and grief, free from hunger and thirst, which desires nothing and imagines nothing. It is the persisting spirit, that which remains constant in all the vicissitudes of waking, dream and sleep, death, rebirth and deliverance. The whole account assumes that there is consciousness even in the apparently unconscious states, when we sleep, when we are drugged or stunned.

In the *Chhandogya* there is a variation of the truth expressed in an earlier Upanishad which describes an ultimate spiritual state as

one wherein "the father is father no more; nor the mother a mother; nor the worlds, worlds; here the scriptures are no longer scriptures. For the Spirit of man is not followed by good, he is not followed by evil." (*Brihad Upanishad.*) The "That Thou Art" section of the *Chhandogya Upanished* ends with this passage:

> They bind a man and bring him: He has stolen, they say; he has committed theft. Heat the axe *for the ordeal*: and if he is the doer of it, and makes himself untrue; maintaining untruth, and wrapping himself in untruth, he grasps the heated axe; he burns, and so dies. But if he be not the doer of it, he makes himself true; maintaining truth, and wrapping himself in truth, he grasps the heated axe; he burns not; and so goes free. And the truth that saves him from burning is the Self of all that is, this is the Real, this the Self. THAT THOU ART, O Shvetaketu.

Joseph L. Henderson, Jungian psychologist, in *The Wisdom of the Serpent,* comments on the meaning of such instructions as those contained in the *Upanishads*—where sleep and dreams, and recurrent progress through psychological deaths and rebirths, approximate the path of the pilgrim soul:

> Somewhere between the myths of death and rebirth and the myths of death and resurrection we find abundant evidence for another theme in which the experience of death and rebirth is central—the theme of initiation. Initiation provides the archetypal pattern by which the psyche whether in individuals or in groups of people, is enabled to make a transition from one stage of development to another.

Meditation is the means by which the pupil gains control of the contemplative powers. Radhakrishnan's discussion of the *Chhandogya Upanishad* describes why the mystic syllable *aum* is there suggested as a gateway to recognition of the "formless" which generates all form:

> The syllable *aum,* with which every recital of the Vedic chants begins, is here represented as the symbol of the Supreme and therefore the means of the meditation of the Supreme. In meditation, the soul is furnished with a symbol on which we fix our gaze, on which we concentrate all our imagination and reasoning. When meditation reaches its end, when there is no distraction or disquiet, when there is calm repose, sweet tranquility, there is the vision. Any name may raise us to perfect contemplation. We start with prayer, we pass on to meditation. When the discursive acts cease, we have contemplation. The Upanishad opens with this instruction to concentrate on the syllable *aum,* to draw our thoughts away from all other subjects, to develop ekagrata or

one-pointedness. Symbol cannot be taken as final. It has a number of aspects. When it is transposed into the words of ordinary language it becomes dim and rigid. We then tend to confine the meaning within narrow dogmatic frames. Even though the syllable *aum* like all symbols covers the reality as by a veil, to those who know how to look the veil becomes transparent.

Esoterikon

I stepped aside and listened as my soul
Came singing down the avenues of time.
Her bright hair streaming in an aureole,
She chanted ballads of empyreal rhyme;
And though the words were dim to me,
No shadow veiled that melody.

Her paeans flowed from unconditioned spheres
Where here and near and distant are the same,
From timeless aeons in which days and years,
Centuries, seconds, hours, are but a name;
Her tones came vibrant with the force
And beauty of their splendid source.

Against the walls of time, the arch of space,
Those full unmeasured cadences rang out,
Echoing back and round, till all the place
Wherein I stood was filled with such a shout
Of music, such compelling sound,
The very heavens seemed unbound.

A torrent then of rays prismatic-hued
Enflooded all, merging into a white
Pulsating glory that was sound and light—
Luminous music—within whose amplitude
Of love and power was left no trace
Of walls of time nor arch of space.

My soul is singing; but my lips are mute,
Hushed in the wonder of the Absolute.

ENVIRONMENT AND THE QUALITIES

EVERYONE is engaged in changing his environment, consciously or without specific awareness. For what is environment? And what the nature and need of change?

If we think of ourselves as the personal man, concern will be primarily with immediate physical surroundings—where we live, what work must be done, how adequate is our income to sustain us in our present circumstances?

We may or may not know *about* karma or that reincarnation is the law of human life; food is assimilated without knowledge of the intricate processes of digestion, and we may live in a land of freedom without knowledge of the history of government. It is when we are concerned with *why* we are where we are that we may come to *know* the meaning of karma and reincarnation.

What we think we are determines our attitude toward environment. Surroundings inevitably change. Things deteriorate, acquaintances shift about or die, crops flourish or fail, wars end or are imminent. But is this the environment of the real man?

> Man, made of thought, occupant only of many bodies from time to time, is eternally thinking. His chains are through thought, his release due to nothing else. (*Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita,* p. 141.)

Thinking qualifies environment. It is *tamasic* when we succumb to it, however choice the material aspects of this environment may appear to be. It is *rajasic* when we resent, oppose, criticize, or fight it—swimming in a sea of irritations and frustration. It is *sattvic* as we understand and work with it.

The turning-point in the life of Arjuna is indicated in the words of Krishna at the opening of Chapter Nine: "Unto thee who findeth no fault I will now make known this most mysterious knowledge, coupled with a realization of it, which having known thou shalt be delivered from evil. This is the royal knowledge, the royal mystery, the most excellent purifier, clearly comprehensible, not opposed to sacred law, easy to perform, and inexhaustible. Those who are un-

believers in this truth, O harasser of thy foes, find me not, but revolving in rebirth return to this world, the mansion of death."

Concern, then, should not be with the environment but with our attitude toward it. Environment may seem like a wall that hedges us in, but right attitude enables us to use that wall as a means to enlarge our scope for the development of the powers latent within us. The view from the top of the wall enlarges the range of vision and places the "climb" in its true perspective, the wall in another light.

> Chafe not at Karma, nor at Nature's changeless laws. But struggle only with the personal, the transitory, the evanescent and the perishable.
>
> Help Nature and work on with her; and Nature will regard thee as one of her creators and make obeisance.
>
> (*The Voice of the Silence.*)

The Cultural Continuum

The *Natya Shastra* explains that when, after the end of the Golden Age, the intellectual capacity of man became smaller, the wise men met together and appealed to Brahma the Creator, asking him for a method of teaching that would be less abstract and within the reach of all. The god then taught the wise man Bharata the arts of the stage: music, mime, the dance and dramatic art. Taken together they were called the fifth Veda, because by their means all knowledge useful to man can easily be imparted to him. This method of teaching does not call for previous technical studies; it is therefore readily intelligible and open to men and women of all castes and all callings alike. This legend shows clearly the exceptional place which the arts have always occupied in Hindu civilization and the respect and honour in which artists were held since art was one of the essential methods in the teaching and intellectual training of the people.

—Alain Danielou

YOUTH FORUM

Often in her writings, H. P. Blavatsky speaks of the importance (and the important failings) of education in our society and of the great need for educational reform. Certainly the timeliness of this subject has not diminished with the passing of years, and we find that today we must continue to think about it, and ask ourselves whether, for all the external advances America has made in its educational system, we have come any closer to the theosophical ideal than we had in 1875.

Speaking as one who has just undergone exposure to the "system," I would say that it is extremely useful and broadening in its present form, and at the same time extremely pernicious. Never before has so much important information been immediately available to students, and yet never, it seems to me, has that information meant so little to them. "Hotbeds of selfishness," H.P.B. called the schools of her time. Today, though, everything is much brighter and more clinical than it was in those days; and one is tempted to say that there are no longer hotbeds of anything; just the plain selfishness, just the indifference. Such a judgment must of course be too harsh to be accurate. And certainly it is a good thing that a student who goes through four years at a liberal arts college can know more about physical science than even Galileo or Copernicus did, and can at the same time have contact with a bewildering variety of opinions, philosophies, and attitudes about the world. The trouble comes, however, when nothing is done about this bewilderment, or is even encouraged to be done. The variety is just variety, like the various cards in a deck; all pertinent information has already been summarized by the experts and arranged alphabetically for convenience. It almost seems, then, that the very ease with which information can now be acquired is itself a part of the perniciousness of our present system. A college sophomore may or may not "know" more than Galileo about the structure of the universe, but it is almost certain that he knows nothing at first hand, and may not even particularly care about the "subject" at all.

It would not, of course, be any solution to the problem merely to make the information more difficult to attain. Rather, the solution must (at least in part) depend upon finding and recognizing good teachers—and also upon the students themselves. A good teacher—or a good student—is one who is not fooled by the accessibility of mountains of information, but who is driven by a thirst for a deeper and more real knowledge, and understands that all the books listed in his college curriculum are merely tools for his use (and perhaps not even the most important tools) in that greater search. Today's education is dry, boring, or merely interesting, because the knowledge offered has been drained of all its moral significance and suggestiveness. Copernicus, we know, had an almost religious fervor in his search for an understanding of astronomy, and believed that angels inhabited the celestial worlds. And Newton, perhaps the greatest of scientists, considered his commentaries on the Book of Daniel to be the most important work. But what can give fiber to our search today? The universe is simply not as small now as it was in Elizabethan or even Restoration times. Cosmic harmonies are much more difficult to perceive, and, after the revelations of Freud and Darwin, one is likely at times to experience radical doubts as to the existence of any absolutes at all. Sartre, avoiding this whole issue, would say that God may or may not happen to exist; but since man can have no relationship with Him in this present alienated world, it is in a certain sense not *important* whether He exists or not. What matters is the here and now, he tells us; and many philosophers writing today would agree with him. But one wonders why, if God is left out of all discussion, even the here and now should matter very much—and why college survey courses in the physical science of Galileo should matter at all.

I would not suggest that God be suddenly re-inserted into the discussion. If Jehovah is on the way out as an assumption in our minds, that is probably a healthy sign, an indication that one more fetter of egocentric anthropomorphism is falling away. But to doubt—or even ignore—the existence of any absolute principle whatever—surely this is a sign of moral decay. The universe is not so simple as it seemed in the times of the optimistic philosophers of the past; but if a spiritual basis for morality is not as easily available as it was, is that not all the more reason for us to search for it more strongly than we ever have done before?

We have a terribly dangerous tendency nowadays to believe what

the experts tell us. Will we believe them if they should have a meeting tomorrow and legislate God out of existence? Practically speaking, they have done so already (except in the upper echelons), and, practically speaking, most college students have tacitly believed them, or at least have lost interest in trying to *find out for themselves*. No doubt these students are right in assuming that they will not be able to commune with the Deity, as university students, or as the Class of '65. But what is disturbing is the apparent lack of private stirring beneath the surface, any secret hankering or aspiration, at least of the sort that would ultimately turn into a quest, a determined and uncompromising effort to search "God" out within the Self and within each other.

College students should be cautioned about experts. Nothing is known. Everything remains to be done or done over. Go quickly, and transform understanding as only you can.

Why are not some such words as these spoken to every student upon his entering and leaving college? And why is it that many students would not comprehend the warning even if it were uttered? Just how long do we hope to continue to live in our adolescent American dream, with the scientist acting as father, material comforts mothering us, and our duty in life reduced to work for good marks, or for money?

EDUCATION

I confess myself utterly at a loss in suggesting particular reforms in our ways of teaching. No discretion than can be lodged with a school-committee, with the overseers or visitors of an academy, of a college, can at all avail to reach these difficulties and perplexities, but they solve themselves when we leave institutions and address individuals.

—RALPH WALDO EMERSON

HUMANITY—THE IMPERFECT EXPRESSION

> Humanity, as a whole, is in reality a materialized though as yet very imperfect expression of the Hierarchies of the Dhyan Chohans. —H. P. BLAVATSKY

THE doctrine teaches that, in order to become a divine, fully conscious god, the Spiritual primeval INTELLIGENCES must pass through the human stage. And when we say human, this does not apply merely to our terrestrial humanity, but to the mortals that inhabit any world. Each Entity must have won for itself the right of becoming divine, through self-experience. One has to remember that, in the Hindu philosophy, every differentiated unit is such only through the cycle of Maya, being one in essence with the Supreme or One Spirit. Having connected himself with every atom in manifested *Space,* the *Pilgrim,* having struggled through and suffered in every form of life and being, is only at the bottom of the valley of matter, and half through his cycle, when he has identified himself with collective Humanity. This, *he has made in his own image.*

Occultism defines and limits the number of primordial races to seven, because of the "seven progenitors," or *prajapatis,* the evolvers of beings. They are neither gods, nor supernatural Beings, but advanced Spirits from another and lower planet, reborn on this one, and giving birth in their turn in the present Round to present Humanity. There is not an old fragment but shows belief in a multiform and even multigeneric evolution—spiritual, psychic, intellectual and physical—of human beings. Our races, they all show, have sprung from divine races, by whatever names they are called. Every nation held its first god and gods to be androgynous; nor could it be otherwise, since they regarded their distant primeval progenitors, their dual-sexed ancestors, as divine Beings and Gods, just as do the Chinese to this day. And they were divine in one sense, as also were their first human progeny, the "mind-born" primitive humanity, which were most assuredly bi-sexual, as all the more ancient symbols and traditions show.

NOTE.—A student's collation from standard Theosophical writings.

The first humanity was a pale copy of its progenitors; too material, even in its ethereality, to be a hierarchy of gods; too spiritual and pure to be MEN, endowed as it is with every *negative* perfection. Perfection, to be fully such, must be born out of imperfection, the *incorruptible* must grow out of the corruptible, having the latter as its vehicle and basis and contrast. Each class of Creators endows man with what it has to give. It is those who are unable to create the spiritual immortal man, who project the senseless model (the *Astral*) of the physical Being. They could not make men as they were themselves—perfect, because sinless; sinless, because having only the first, pale shadowy outlines of attributes, and these all perfect—from the human standpoint—white, pure and cold as the virgin snow. The *Barhishad,* though possessed of *creative fire,* were devoid of the higher MAHAT-mic element. Being on a level with the lower principles—those which precede gross objective matter—they could only give birth to the outer man, or rather to the model of the physical, the astral man. Humanity, "of the Earth earthy," was not destined to be created by the angels of the first divine Breath: therefore the latter are said to have refused to do so, and men had to be formed by more material creators who, in their turn, could only give what they had in their natures, and no more. Subservient to eternal law, the pure gods could only project out of themselves *shadowy* men, a little less ethereal and spiritual, less *divine and perfect* than themselves—shadows still. The Monads which incarnated in these empty SHELLS, remained as unconscious as when separated from their previous incomplete forms and vehicles. There is no potentiality for creation, or self-Consciousness, in a *pure* Spirit on this our plane, unless its too homogeneous, perfect, because divine, nature is, so to say, mixed with, and strengthened by, an essence already differentiated.

The *Agnishwatta* were devoid of the grosser *creative fire,* hence unable to create physical man, having no *double* or astral body, to project, since they were without any form. Yet it is they alone who could complete man, i.e., make of him a self-conscious, almost a divine being—a god on earth. It was those who would not "multiply," who sacrificed themselves to the good and salvation of *Spiritual Humanity.*

Esoteric philosophy shows that man is truly the manifested deity in both its aspects—good and evil, but theology cannot admit this philosophical truth. Teaching the dogma of the Fallen Angels in

its dead-letter meaning, and having made of Satan the corner-stone and pillar of the dogma of redemption—to do so would be suicidal. Having once shown the rebellious angels *distinct from God and the Logos* in their personalities, the admission that the downfall of the *disobedient* Spirits meant simply their fall into generation and matter, would be equivalent to saying that God and Satan were identical. For since the LOGOS (or God) is the aggregate of that once divine Host accused of having fallen, it would follow that the Logos and Satan are one.

The subject of Æschylus' drama is known to all cultured readers. The demi-god robs the gods (the Elohim) of their secret—the mystery of the *creative fire*. For this sacrilegious attempt he (Prometheus) is struck down by Kronos ("time") and delivered unto Zeus, the Father and creator of a mankind which he would wish to have blind intellectually, and animal-like; a *personal* deity, which will not see MAN "like one of us." The *Crucified* Titan (Prometheus) is the personified symbol of the collective Logos, the "Host," and of the "Lords of Wisdom" or the Heavenly Man, who incarnated in Humanity. Prometheus having endowed man, according to Plato's "Protagoras," with that "wisdom which ministers to physical well-being," but the lower aspect of *manas* of the animal (*Kama*) having remained unchanged—instead of "an untainted mind, heaven's first gift" (Æschylus), there was created the eternal vulture of the ever unsatisfied desire, of regret and despair coupled with "the dreamlike feebleness that fetters the blind race of mortals," unto the day when Prometheus is released by his heaven-appointed deliverer, Herakles.

The fire received has turned into the greatest curse: the animal element, and *consciousness* of its possession, has changed periodical instinct into chronic animalism and sensuality. It is this which hangs over humanity like a heavy funeral pall. Thus arises the responsibility of free-will; the Titanic passions which represent humanity in its darkest aspect; the "restless insatiability of the lower passions and desires, when, with self-asserting insolence they bid defiance to the restraints of law."

If one breaks the laws of Harmony, or, as a theosophical writer expresses it, "the laws of life," one must be prepared to fall into the chaos one produced. Therefore, if any one is helpless before these immutable laws, it is not ourselves, the artificers of our destinies, but rather those angels, the guardians of harmony. Karma-

Nemesis is no more than the (spiritual) dynamical effects of causes produced and forces awakened into activity by our own actions. The "Fallen Angels," so called, are *Humanity itself*. The Demon of Pride, Lust, Rebellion, and Hatred, has never had *any being before* the appearance of physical conscious man. It is man who has begotten, nurtured, and allowed the fiend to develop in his heart; he, again, who has contaminated the indwelling god in himself, by linking the pure spirit with the impure demon of matter. And, if the Kabalistic saying, *"Demon est Deus inversus"* finds its metaphysical and theoretical corroboration in dual manifested nature, its practical application is found in Mankind alone.

Creative powers in man were the gift of divine wisdom, not the result of sin. Nor was the curse of KARMA called down for seeking *natural* union, as all the mindless animal-world does in its proper seasons; but, for abusing the creative power, for desecrating the divine gift, and wasting the life-essence for no purpose except bestial personal gratification. Nature has never intended that woman should bring forth her young "in sorrow." The divine Titan has then suffered in vain; and one feels inclined to regret his benefaction to mankind. Our *Saviours,* the Agnishwatta and other divine "Sons of the Flame of Wisdom" (personified by the Greek Prometheus), may well, in the injustice of the human heart, be left unrecognized and unthanked. They may, in our ignorance of the truth, be indirectly cursed for Pandora's gift: but to find them proclaimed and declared by the mouth of the clergy, the EVIL ONES, is too heavy a Karma for "Him who dared alone"—when Zeus "ardently desired" to quench the entire human race—to save "that mortal race" from perdition.

It is not in the *Kali Yug,* our present terrifically materialistic age of Darkness, the "Black Age," that a new Saviour of Humanity can ever appear.

TWO LETTERS—ON W. Q. JUDGE

DEAR COMPANION:

H.P.B. showed herself a true Teacher when she said, "Do not follow me nor my path; follow the path I show. . . ."

The wisdom of this advice is seen in observing the course of those who judged of the teaching by what they could see of the teacher. They judged her by *their* standards, not by her adhesion to the Theosophy she taught. W. Q. Judge had similar judgment passed on him, primarily because he upheld H.P.B. first, last, and all the time. This was the underlying cause of the attacks made on him by those who should have been his defenders. They were fearful of "authority"—so fearful they tried to convey the impression that *they* could explain her away, could tell where she was right and where she made "mistakes"; thus making a claim to authority that she never made. . . . Judge continually pointed to her as the Teacher to whom all alike should look.

Those who followed his example and advice then, or who will follow it now, found and will find *where she pointed.* In effect it comes to this, that those who professed or who profess to look to H.P.B. as their *Teacher,* do not do so unless they also look on Judge as she looked on Him.

ROBERT CROSBIE

My Dearest Brother and Co-Founder of the Theosophical Society:

In addressing to you this letter, I must first present my hearty congratulations and most cordial good wishes to the assembled Delegates and good Fellows of our Society, and to yourself—the heart and soul of that Body in America. We were several to call it to life through good and evil report. It is to you chiefly, if not entirely, that the Theosophical Society owes its existence in 1888. Let me then thank you for it, for the first and perhaps the last time publicly, and from the bottom of my heart, which beats only for the cause you represent so well and serve so faithfully. . . . Whether I be in England or in India a large part of my heart and much of my hope for Theosophy lie with you in the United States, where the Theosophical Society was founded, and of which country I myself am proud of being a citizen.

Yours ever, in the truth of the GREAT CAUSE we are all working for,

H. P. BLAVATSKY .·.

on the lookout

"Dreaming—A Creative Process"

Writing under this title, Frederick A. Weiss (*Journal of Psychoanalysis*) exemplifies the thinking of those "third force" psychologists about whom much has been written in Lookout because of their characteristic emphasis upon a level of man's nature that is "above" the delusions, illusions, frustrations, etc., of the psychic nature. Here, they see man as a "creator," and insist that this level is as integral to the whole man as is the psychic level generally explored in psychoanalysis. Dr. Weiss, who is a past president of the Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis, introduces his thesis with a quotation from the Upanishads:

> Man in his dream becomes a creator: there are no real chariots in that state, no horses, no roads. There are no blessings there, no joys, but he himself creates blessings, happiness and joys. . . . He indeed is the creator.

Vicissitude of Dream Interpretation

He then says:

> Thus, three thousand years ago, the Upanishads saw the dream as a creative process. In the course of centuries, scarcely any other human phenomenon has become so much the victim of under-estimation as the dream. The dream has been misused in the service of superstition and it has been seen as a meaningless by-product of sleep, as a kind of "short-circuit of the brain."
>
> Modern dream research, both on the psychological and physiological level has begun to re-establish the inherent vital and creative character of the dream. . . . Here the dream is no longer seen as a result of magic force or as a mere by-product of somatic processes, but as a meaningful phenomenon: "the road to the unconscious."

Dead-end Street Becomes a Freeway

This "royal road" of dreams, however, built during the close of the nineteenth century, "clearly reveals the impact of the period in which it was constructed." For example, it has long been thought that the royal road led to an "unconscious" which was "inhabited exclusively by libidinous, aggressive and destructive instincts." On

this view, says Dr. Weiss, "the dream could express no more, and the royal road became a narrow and, often, a dead-end road." However:

> In the holistic view of today, man is no longer seen as an instinct-driven creature but as an integrated organism which lives and grows as a whole in continuous interaction with the environment. . . . Psychoanalytic therapy is seen as a process that fosters emotional change through growing self-awareness and self-confrontation. It can take place only in the warm climate of a mutually trusting doctor-patient relationship in which the patient feels fully accepted and can gradually abandon his defenses. Therapy aims at lessening the alienation, helping the patient to re-connect himself with his roots and to move in the direction of genuine self-acceptance and self-realization. A main task is to help the patient experience and accept himself as he actually is, with his present limitations as well as his potential for healthy growth. In this therapeutic process the dream plays a decisive role.

Dreaming—an Active Process

Dr. Weiss explains why dreams play a decisive role in growing self-awareness:

> Dreaming is an *active,* creative integrating process as the works of Horney, Alexander, and French have shown. Dreaming is by no means merely a *re-active* phenomenon, reactive to a *vis a tergo* [force from behind] such as instinctual pressure; or re-active only to inner or outer stimuli, to a traumatic past, a disturbing present, or a wish for the future. Any or all of these elements may enter the dreaming. In doing so, however, they lose their isolated nature and become transformed into symbolic aspects of a new integrated whole: the dream. Dreaming is not merely a compensatory, a discharge or, to use Maslow's term, a deficiency phenomenon—it is a phenomenon of life and growth.

Insights Through Dreams

According to Poul Bjerre, "there are creative, life-affirmative forces at work in us, and dreams are one of their most important expressions." Dr. Weiss continues:

> Dreaming brings the patient closer to experiencing himself as he is and as the person he can become. The dream has access to aspects of the self which the patient rejected or repressed: neurotic aspects and healthy aspects; the courage to be and realize himself; his capacity for affection and love which he was afraid to experience and express; spiritual aspects which he dis-

regarded or deprecated; physical and emotional needs, the experiencing of which was blocked by pride, a need for control, self-doubt or taboos. *The dream becomes a door to the larger self.*

Symbolization in Dreams

"Present day philosophy and anthropology," says Dr. Weiss, "have come to see the capacity for symbolization as a main aspect of the creativity of man, as an essential quality of being human." One of the most important aspects of man's creativity is his imaginative development of dream symbols. For example:

> In creative symbols, the dreamer meets the self he is—constricted and confined by anxiety; the self he pretends to be—driven by pride and bought at the price of suffering; the self he was—which he felt forced to reject or repress; and the larger self which he is rediscovering and beginning to realize. The dreamer confronts the ways in which he aggrandizes and idealizes his self, the ways in which he effaces, neglects and often destroys his self, and the ways in which he uses others in the service of these unconscious drives, thus dehumanizing potential I-thou relationships to mere I-it relationships.
>
> Symbolization in dreams is by no means a negative reductive process. It is a highly creative holistic and dynamic phenomenon. Transcending the narrow level of the libido, it uses the whole realm of human experience—aspects of nature and culture, myth and reality, color, form, movement and sound—to crystallize the dreamer's total feelings, needs, conflicts, and attempts at solution.

No Stereotyped Symbols

Toward the end of the section on "Dreams" (in *Transactions*), H. P. Blavatsky says that there are no means of interpreting dreams but "the clairvoyant faculty and the spiritual intuition of the 'interpreter'." She continues: "Every dreaming Ego differs from every other. . . . If everything in the universe has seven keys to its symbolism on the physical plane, how many keys may it not have on higher planes?"

Dr. Weiss also emphasizes the wide range of symbol interpretation, showing by examples how the stereotyped interpretation is never applicable to every person, how the same symbol does not mean the same "thing" to the same person at different times, and even how a symbol may change in meaning during the course of a single dream. He adds:

The creative mastery of the dream reaches its height when it approaches the original meaning of "symbol." Derived from the Greek *symballein,* it means: that which is thrown together, formed by being fused. The dream image fuses two conflicting affects or strivings. What is needed in psychoanalytic therapy is not the reduction of the symbol to stereotypes, but the opening up and the full experiencing of the emotional conflict which is condensed in it.

Many autobiographical reports of scientists and artists relate how, after a long period of effort which ended in temporary frustration, they were helped by their dreams. . . . The dream, however, fulfills its most important creative function as the latent phase in man's growing self-awareness and self-realization.

Recapitulation

The following from Dr. Weiss's Recapitulation shows how much his interpretation of "the dream" differs from that of the rigid Freudian psychoanalyst:

1. Dreaming is not merely a reactive phenomenon, reactive to instinctual pressure, inner and outer stimuli, a traumatic past or a disturbing present. Dreaming is an active, creative process.

2. Dreaming is not an irrational, regressive, libidinous phenomenon, but a dynamic biological function of the human organism. It reflects the striving for self-realization whether it is fully expressed or blocked by anxiety-charged neurotic needs.

3. Dreaming is characterized by a widened scope of perception, particularly of self-awareness.

4. Dreaming occurs in a state of lessened self-alienation and can become a "door to the larger self."

5. Symbol formation in dreams is not a reductive process, characterized by perceptive insufficiency, regression and censorship. It is a creative act in which the dreamer's strivings, conflicts and attempts at solution are crystallized. The past enters the dream as a dynamic symbol of the present.

6. Dreaming is the latent phase of creative insight and self-realization. It is man's encounter with himself, his life (past, present and future) and his world.

7. The dream becomes a creative force in therapy if it is permitted to speak for itself, if the therapist does not become a killer of the dream by reducing it to preconceived stereotypes, and if the patient learns to "own" his dream.

The Theosophic Emphasis

A passage from H.P.B.'s Appendix on "Dreams" in the *Transactions* will be suggestive of the direction in which contemporary

"third force" psychology seems to be moving:

> If we admit the existence of a higher or permanent *Ego* in us —which Ego must not be confused with what we call the "Higher Self"—we can comprehend that what we often regard as dreams, generally accepted as idle fancies, are, in truth, stray pages torn out from the life and experiences of the *inner* man, and the dim recollection of which at the moment of awakening becomes more or less distorted by our physical memory. The latter catches mechanically a few impressions of the thoughts, facts witnessed, and deeds performed by the *inner* man during its hours of complete freedom. For our *Ego* lives its own separate life within its prison of clay whenever it becomes free from trammels of matter, *i.e.*, during the sleep of the physical man. This Ego it is which is the actor, the real man, the true human self. But the physical man cannot feel or be conscious during dreams; for the personality, the outer man, with its brain and thinking apparatus, are paralyzed more or less completely.
>
> Since dreams are in reality the actions of the Ego during physical sleep, they are, of course, recorded on their own plane and produce their effects on this one. But it must be always remembered that dreams in general, and as we know them, are simply our waking and hazy recollections of these facts.
>
> It is by cultivating the power of what is called "dreaming" that clairvoyance is developed.

The Religious "Encounter"

Archie J. Bahm of the University of New Mexico, in *The World's Living Religions* (Dell, 1964; 75 cents), notes that "a new trend in religious thinking augurs arrival of a new dimension in religious outlook." A part of this new dimension is the realization by Christians that they are now engaged in an "encounter" with other religions—"something they can no longer run away from if they choose." Yet even among liberal Christian professors in seminaries, Dr. Bahm observes, there is a general tendency to take their own religion as a standard. This is not an adequate stance from which to study religions comparatively, Dr. Bahm believes. He explains:

> My own view is that "comparative religions" does not exist in its fullest and fairest sense until judgments are based upon standards common to all of them and until each religion that proposes a standard of its own by which to measure other religions is also measured by standards proposed by other religions. . . . My experience, after abandoning as inadequate the sectarian outlook in which I was trained, has consisted in a century in state universities. In such an environment, not only relatively free from pressures of sectarian biases but suffused with an atmos-

phere requiring one to be fair to all of them, my own desire to be fair received both sanction and support. Although doubtless I cannot wholly escape the influences of my Christian training and of the Western civilization in which my mind has been nurtured and shaped, genuineness of commitment to democratic ideals has demanded of me that fairness and objectivity of treatment be extended from Western sects to world religions. Sympathetic study of them has revealed both virtues unsuspected by outsiders and broader bases for comparison. Prolonged accommodation to the task of trying to represent each religion in terms of its own perspective, and a personal philosophy that holds that there is some truth to all positive views, have made me no longer capable of supporting a sectarian bias, unless bias against bias is itself somehow sectarian.

The Golden Rule—East and West

After discussing the religions of India—Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism, Vedantism and Yoga (all more or less familiar to students of Theosophy)—Dr. Bahm takes up the religions of China. Here he brings out the contrast between the biblical form and the Golden Rule as a commandment and the Confucian expression of the same law of reciprocity as a *principle,* which finds a much deeper expression in Taoist philosophy:

> In addition to stating the principle as a rule—"Do not require of another what you would not have another require of you"—Confucius added a phrase that reveals his insight to be more penetrating. This phrase is generally neglected. It is: "if you were that person." That is, "treat another as you would be treated if you were that person." This kind of treatment considers actual differences between persons and takes them into account in deciding how to act according to the principle of reciprocity. It is important to notice that greater insight, *i.e.,* sympathetic insight, is needed in order to act on this principle. For one needs to make the effort to think about the nature and feelings of the other person in order to know how he would like to be treated if he were that other person.

The Zen Attitude in Daily Living

Much has been written in Lookout regarding Zen—its underlying philosophy, its rationale, its Beatnik fringe, etc. Dr. Bahm is concerned with what might be called the Zen *attitude.* Speaking of the appeal of Zen, he evidences the same sympathy which is characteristic of many existentialists:

> Zen itself is mysterious ultimately not because it originates in a foreign culture but because it emphasizes attention to omni-

present values so simple and obvious as to be transparent. They remain hidden from us because, like our eyes, we see *through* them rather than see *them*. . . .

In Zen, life steers the self rather than the reverse. . . .
Zen is entirely, or basically, intuitive. . . .
Zen may overlie and supervene upon practical interests.

Dr. Bahm's enthusiasm, however, leads in one instance to a rather heavy-handed attempt to apply such insights. His argument for Zen on the basis of its "practicality" may bring opposition from liberals in general; the "exploitation" of Zen attitudes might be identified with an indifference to social reform. For example, Dr. Bahm says:

Industrial uses of Zen are endless. Machine operation may be eased and speeded through Zen techniques. Money spent on efficiency experts and on time and motion studies remain inadequate until the financial possibilities of Zen attitudes have been exploited. The reader probably has some personal skill so fully perfected that he can recognize himself slipping into a Zen attitude during moments of peak performance. A glowing awareness of efficient mastery yields an enjoyment of automatic self-and-machine manipulation quite apart from interest in production goals. Where complex, sensitive, and rapid responses are needed in machine operation, attainment of a Zen attitude reduces strain and fatigue, and increases enjoyment.

A Christian Becoming a Humanist

Dr. Bahm's first study of comparative religions struck some theosophical readers as pedantic and insensitive, but the present volume indicates a more philosophical attitude. And the importance of the Humanist movement is indicated in such passages as the following: "The democratic ideals of Thomas Jefferson and other signers of the American Constitution accepted Humanistic ideals and hopes and embodied them by declaring as inalienable the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The American Constitution is a major Humanistic document, and the Government of the United States stands as a supreme example of a Humanistic institution."

Finally, Dr. Bahm insists upon the recognition of man as "religious" and "humanistic," at one and the same time—and hopes for some common denominator of ethical aspiration:

Our philosophical task is to understand our ultimate nature and value; and our religious task is to attempt to attain that value. To the extent that we cannot successfully pursue our efforts without an adequate philosophy, our religion depends upon our philosophy. But to the extent that philosophy, having

as its problem the understanding of such ultimate nature and value, derives its problems from man's practical, *i.e.*, religious, need for such understanding—and its usefulness as an actual guide to such attainment—it is dependent, even completely dependent, upon the conception of man as religious.

Appreciative Recognition

In a review of Herbert Fingarette's *The Self in Transformation* (Canadian *Theosophist,* September-October, 1964), Dudley W. Barr shares the appreciation of this book expressed in these pages. (See THEOSOPHY 51:351.) Mr. Barr says:

> This important book should be of unusual interest to Theosophical students for several reasons including its psychological approach to the doctrines of reincarnation and karma.
>
> It is not a book of easy reading. A layman in psychology, such as I am, must struggle with the technical terminology, including the varied and peculiar meanings attached in psychology to such words as "self," "ego" and "superego," for "in psychoanalysis the term 'self' has no unambiguous systematic use." Dr. Fingarette speaks also of "an immanent self, an approaching Subject who stands 'out of time' and 'out of process,' who apprehends in a different mode and exists in a different mode, who is the eternal (nontemporal) subject of all temporal experience. . . . This 'essential' self can be juxtaposed with the Atman of the Upanishads, the *purusha.*"

A Psychologist Considers the Twin Doctrines

Dr. Barr continues:

> For theosophical students the heart of the book lies in those chapters in which are introduced the concept of the eternal Self and the concept of reincarnation and karma. So far as I am aware this is the first time that such teachings have received approving consideration in a book of this nature. There is a seventy page chapter, "Karma and the Inner World," in which karma and reincarnation are examined psychologically. Dr. Fingarette is not presenting his own personal beliefs in this book and while it seems apparent that the twin doctrines are acceptable to him and indeed form part of his own approach to philosophy, he maintains the critical detachment of a scientist in viewing the ordinarily accepted presentation of reincarnation. ". . . in our discussion of karma and reincarnation, we will not have jumped into an anti-scientific position, nor will we be treating reincarnation as 'pseudo' or as 'super' science. The real issues are philosophical. They have nothing to do with amassing reports of *wunderkinder,* Indian yogis, or the periodic newspaper sensationalisms exploiting fakes or unfortunates claiming inexplicable knowledge of past events. These 'marvels' are as philo-

sophically uninteresting to us as it turns out that they are to the great prophets of karma." The doctrine of karma is presented as not necessarily tied exclusively to its familiar connotations with reincarnation over a series of earth lives.

The important point for the Theosophical student is that the *psychological* implications of karma are seriously considered in *The Self in Transformation.*

Mail-Order Hallucinogens

The New York *Journal-American* (Jan. 8) reported information revealed by Drs. Ludwig and Levine in a "current *AMA* Journal." Drawing on this article, the newspaper writes:

> The so-called hallucinogenic drugs—also called mind-altering drugs—can be simply ordered from a "cactus company" in Texas and also from certain grocery stores in Greenwich Village, Harlem and Lower Manhattan.
>
> Some patients reported that they had been able to order (mescaline) directly from a pharmaceutical house or through local drug stores. There were also reports of the drug being synthesized by college students in New York and in the Boston area. One patient actually saw the drug being made and did ingest some and found the results to be identical to mescaline he had obtained previously from other sources.
>
> Peyote and mescaline both are obtained from the peyote cactus plant, found largely in arid regions of Mexico. LSD is being distributed in sugar cubes, the article said. And since certain enforcement agencies have now declared sugar cubes to be contraband, some LSD is being distributed on animal crackers.
>
> "It is common for friends to share hallucinogenic drugs and they are frequently dispensed at parties in much the same way as alcoholic drinks," the *AMA* said. "Hallucinogens are not sold by narcotics pushers, but by those dealing in barbiturates (goof balls), amphetamines (pep pills), and marijuana," the article reported.

Strange-Variety of Hallucinations

The following experiences show the extreme danger of the use of these drugs:

> The drugs alter sensory perception and produce weird results in the user. One patient tried to stab himself, believing he was "invincible." Another thought "he was going insane" and "ran his head into the wall to stop the experience." A mescaline user tried to jump off a bridge, "believing his mind and body to be separate and his mind would live on if his body should die." Another tried to jump out a window "believing his body to be weightless."